arXiv:1304.1474v1 [gr-qc] 4 Apr 2013

The $SL(\mathbf{2},\mathbb{R})$ totally constrained model: three quantization approaches.

Rodolfo Gambini⋆ and Javier Olmedo†
Instituto de Física, Facultad de Ciencias, Iguá 4225, esq. Mataojo, Montevideo, Uruguay
rgambini@fisica.edu.uy⋆, jolmedo@fisica.edu.uy†

Abstract

We provide a detailed comparison of the different approaches available for the quantization of a totally constrained system whose constraint algebra corresponds to a non-compact $SL(2,\mathbb{R})$ Lie algebra. In particular, we consider three schemes: the Refined Algebraic Quantization, the Master Constraint Programme and the Uniform Discretizations approach. For the latter, we provide a quantum description where the physical Hilbert space is a subspace of the kinematical one whose basic bricks are eigenstates of the Hamiltonian associated to the infrared counterpart of its discrete spectrum. We conclude that our physical Hilbert space together with a (quantum-mechanically) modified $so(2,1)\times so(2,1)$ observable algebra reproduces a semiclassical limit compatible with the continuum theory, up to corrections of the Planck order.

1 Introduction

Fully constrained models are a class of settings that successfully describe the physics of systems largely characterized by certain symmetries. However, the quantization of fully constrained systems encounters several obstacles undermining the validity of the resulting microscopical description. The usual strategy for first class systems, proposed originally by Dirac [1], consists of representing the constraints as quantum operators on a given Hilbert space, identifying the quantum observables and states invariant under the symmetries generated by the constrains and, if they give rise to a large enough set, endow them with a Hilbert space structure. One of the most prominent examples is gravity, which turns out to be difeomorphism invariant. In particular, if one tries to carry out a quantum description of general relativity, it is a priori impossible to ignore the constraints if one is interested in the quantum dynamics. Specifically, the quantum implementation of the dynamics is one of the reasons because the quantization programme of Loop Quantum Gravity [2, 3, 4], one of the strongest candidates accounting for a quantum description of gravity, is still incomplete.

In the last years, several approaches have emerged attempting to shed light on the fundamental description of this kind of models. One of the quantization programmes that will be considered in this manuscript is the so-called Algebraic Quantization [5] (and its more modern version known as Refined Algebraic Quantization [6, 7]). In particular, in this approach one assumes that given a kinematical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}$ and a $*$-algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\text{obs}}$ of observables, the latter are represented on a dense, linear subspace $\Phi \subset \mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}$, while the constraints have solutions belonging to the algebraic dual Φ^* of Φ. The final step consists of endowing with a suitable Hilbert space structure this space of solutions, following on the physical Hilbert space, and looking for a suitable representation of Dirac observables on it. In many cases this last step is accomplished by applying, e.g., the group averaging technique [8]. This method can be applied without major difficulties if one knows an invariant domain of the quantum constraints. But in occasions such a domain is not known or pathological in so far as it either prevents the application of the group averaging technique or introduces ambiguities that require additional inputs in order to achieve a consistent quantum theory. A complementary procedure is available when a complete set of observables is known, and requires reality condition on them. This requirement turns out to uniquely select an inner product [9], and the completion of the space of solutions with gives the physical Hilbert space.

A second possibility was put forward in Refs. [10, 11] with the Master Constraint Quantization. It arises with the purpose of solving the previous inconvenient, usually associated with the situations where either there is little (or even no) control on the resulting group generated by the set of constraints like, e.g., non-amenable groups, or when the Poisson algebra of the constraints shows non-trivial structure functions, and consequently there is no group at all. The Master Constraint Programme tries to replace the (possibly complicated) algebra by a much simpler Master Constraint Algebra given by the single Master Constraint $\mathbf{M}$, defined basically as a quadratic form of the original constraints and which commutes with itself. Although this quantization scheme fails to detect weak Dirac observables by means of linear conditions on them, this problem is avoided by considering second order conditions. This approach has been successfully tested in many situations [12, 13].

Finally, a recent approach, known as the Uniform Discretizations [14], has emerged in parallel following in part the lines of the Master Constraint Quantization and attempting to improve other discrete quantization procedures known as consistent discretizations [15]. In fact, this new paradigm essentially consists in recovering the original, continuum theory from a set of discrete theories, just like, e.g., continuum QCD can be recovered from lattice QCD. The advantage that this new approach presents is that one starts with a discrete version of the continuum theory that is under control, free of drawbacks, and where a consistent quantum description is available, a priori, since there are no constraints to be imposed. The prize that one has to pay is that the discrete theory will contain a higher number of degrees of freedom with respect to the continuum one, but keeping in mind that the latter can be systematically obtained from its discrete version thanks to the existence of certain conserved quantities (with respect to the evolution) characterizing the continuum limit. Additionally, it succeeds in identifying both discrete and continuum Dirac observables. That is, given a discrete constant of motion one can identify its corresponding perennial in the continuum limit, and viceversa, for a given perennial in the continuum model there are in general many discrete constants of the motion associated with.

The main purpose of this manuscript is to confront these different quantization schemes in a simple but pathological, totally constrained system, which is characterized by two Hamiltonians and one diffeomorphism constraints satisfying an $SL(2,\mathbb{R})$ Lie algebra. This toy model was originally introduced in Ref. [16] testing so the Dirac approach, together with a deeper analysis regarding its dynamics carried out in Ref. [17]. Besides, a considerable number of publications [18, 19, 20] has appeared within the Algebraic Quantization, and also when testing the Master Constraint Programme [13]. In both schemes, the constraints can be imposed simultaneously at the quantum level, but the final physical Hilbert space requires additional inputs for achieving a semiclassical limit compatible with the classical theory. More specifically, in Algebraic Quantization approach [16, 18, 19, 20] the group averaging technique cannot be suitably applied since the symmetry group is non-amenable. Therefore, in these cases, one has to appeal to the reality conditions of a given family of Dirac observables in order to determine the inner product of the physical Hilbert space. Similarly, in the Master Constraint Programme [13], the physical Hilbert space with the correct semiclassical limit is obtained after incorporating in the Master Constraint additional information about the Dirac observables that turns out in a cut off of the quantum theory.

In conclusion, all this proposals incorporate at their fundamental level information about the observables. But in more realistic settings, as gravity, this requirement can defeat the completion of the quantum description, essentially because of the difficulty that entails the identification of Dirac observables. For just such an eventuality, it seems natural to investigate different possibilities, like the one we are proposing in this manuscript. In particular, we adhere to the Uniform Discretizations approach for the quantization of a fully constrained $SL(2,\mathbb{R})$ model. The Hamiltonian which defines the discrete evolution coincides in form with the Master Constraint [13]. After quantization, we consider as candidates for the physical Hilbert space the whole infrared spectrum of the Hamiltonian. There, we identify privileged sectors (whose states have finite norm) that naturally induce restrictions to the accessible expectation values of a given subset of observables. Finally, we modify the remaining algebra quantum-mechanically, such that the modified observable algebra preserves the physical Hilbert space while reproduces a semiclassical limit compatible with the continuum theory. Hence our prescription requires that at the end of the day the theory provide a suitable semiclassical limit, with the observables playing a secondary roll since the fundamental structure of the final quantum theory does not depend on them.

The manuscript is organized as follows. In Sec. 2 we provided a basic description about the classical system. The quantum kinematical framework is introduced in Sec. 3. We provide a detailed description of the Algebraic Quantization and the Master Constraint Programme in Secs. 4 and 5, respectively. In Sec. 6 we present the Uniform Discretizations approach. Finally, the main conclusions can be found in Sec. 7. We have also included the Appendix A with additional technical details.

2 Classical system: Kinematics, constraints and observables

The phase space of our model is composed by four configuration variables u_1, u_2, v_1 and v_2, and their corresponding momenta p_i and π_i, with $i = 1, 2$. This model is endowed with three constraints

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 = \frac{1}{2}(p_1^2 + p_2^2 - v_1^2 - v_2^2), \quad H_2 = \frac{1}{2}(\pi_1^2 + \pi_2^2 - u_1^2 - u_2^2), \\ D = u_1 p_1 + u_2 p_2 - v_1 \pi_1 - v_2 \pi_2, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

whose corresponding algebra is given by

$$\{H_1, H_2\} = D, \quad \{H_1, D\} = -2H_1, \quad \{H_2, D\} = 2H_2. \tag{2}$$

The constants of motion (or Dirac observables) of this system

$$\begin{aligned} O_{12} &= u_1 p_2 - p_1 u_2, \quad & O_{23} &= u_2 v_1 - p_2 \pi_1, \\ O_{13} &= u_1 v_1 - p_1 \pi_1, \quad & O_{24} &= u_2 v_2 - p_2 \pi_2, \\ O_{14} &= u_1 v_2 - p_1 \pi_2, \quad & O_{34} &= \pi_1 v_2 - v_1 \pi_2. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

commute with the three constraints and reflect the global $O(2, 2)$-symmetry codified in the model. They constitute the $so(2, 2)$ Lie algebra which is isomorphic to the $so(2, 1) \times so(2, 1)$ algebra

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1 &= \tfrac{1}{2}(O_{23} + O_{14}), \quad & P_1 &= \tfrac{1}{2}(O_{23} - O_{14}), \\ Q_2 &= \tfrac{1}{2}(-O_{13} + O_{24}), \quad & P_2 &= \tfrac{1}{2}(-O_{13} - O_{24}), \\ Q_3 &= \tfrac{1}{2}(O_{12} - O_{34}), \quad & P_3 &= \tfrac{1}{2}(O_{12} + O_{34}). \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

The Poisson brackets of these observables are

$$\{Q_i, Q_j\} = \epsilon_{ij}{}^k Q_k, \quad \{P_i, P_j\} = \epsilon_{ij}{}^k P_k, \quad \{Q_i, P_j\} = 0 \tag{5}$$

where $\epsilon_{ij}{}^k = g^{lk}\epsilon_{ijl}$, with g^{lk} being the inverse of the metric $g_{lk} = \mathrm{diag}(1, 1, -1)$. The Levi-Civita symbol ϵ_{ijk} is totally antisymmetric with $\epsilon_{123} = 1$. Besides, repeated indexes indicates sum on them.

Furthermore, the following identities between observables and constraints

$$Q_1^2 + Q_2^2 - Q_3^2 = P_1^2 + P_2^2 - P_3^2 = \tfrac{1}{4}(D^2 + 4H_1 H_2) =: \mathcal{C}, \tag{6}$$

$$4Q_3 P_3 = (u_1^2 + u_2^2)H_1 - (u_1 p_1 + u_2 p_2 + v_1 \pi_1 + v_2 \pi_2)D - (v_1^2 + v_2^2)H_2, \tag{7}$$

will be useful from now on. We have also defined $\mathcal{C}$ as the Casimir which commutes with all the constraints and, consequently, with the Dirac observables (it is a combination of constraints).

The condition the three constraints vanish determines the solution space. It has the topology of four cones joined in the origin:

a) $P_3 = 0$ and $Q_3 \in \mathbb{R}$, with $Q_1^2 + Q_2^2 = Q_3^2$,

b) $Q_3 = 0$ and $P_3 \in \mathbb{R}$, with $P_1^2 + P_2^2 = P_3^2$,

c) $Q_3 = 0$ and $P_3 = 0$.

3 Quantization: kinematical Hilbert space

First of all, we will introduce the kinematical Hilbert space where the canonical commutation relations of the phase space variables will be defined. In particular, we will adopt a standard Schrödinger representation of square integrable functions $\mathcal{H}_{\rm kin} = \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$, and $\hbar = 1$. For a given $\psi(u, v) \in \mathcal{H}_{\rm kin}$, the phase space variables are promoted to the operator representation

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{p}_i\psi(u,v) &= -i\partial_{u_i}\psi(u,v), \quad \hat{\pi}_i\psi(u,v) = -i\partial_{v_i}\psi(u,v), \\ \hat{u}_i\psi(u,v) &= u_i\psi(u,v), \quad \hat{v}_i\psi(u,v) = v_i\psi(u,v). \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Within this representation, the quantum operators corresponding to the constraints (1) are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_1 = -\frac{1}{2}(\partial^2_{u_1} + \partial^2_{u_2} + v_1^2 + v_2^2), \quad \hat{H}_2 = -\frac{1}{2}(\partial^2_{v_1} + \partial^2_{v_2} + u_1^2 + u_2^2), \\ \hat{D} = -i(u_1\partial_{u_1} + u_2\partial_{u_2} - v_1\partial_{v_1} - v_2\partial_{v_2}). \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where the factor ordering of $\hat{D}$ is selected such that the quantum commutation relations agree with the classical constraint algebra (2), that is

$$[\hat{H}_1, \hat{H}_2] = i\hat{D}, \quad [\hat{H}_1, \hat{D}] = -2i\hat{H}_1, \quad [\hat{H}_2, \hat{D}] = 2i\hat{H}_2. \tag{10}$$

Regarding the observable algebra (4), since their definition involves product of commuting phase space variables, the corresponding operators will be free of factor ordering ambiguities. Their commutation relations are given by

$$[\hat{Q}_i, \hat{Q}_j] = i\epsilon_{ij}{}^k\hat{Q}_k, \quad [\hat{P}_i, \hat{P}_j] = i\epsilon_{ij}{}^k\hat{P}_k, \quad [\hat{Q}_i, \hat{P}_j] = 0. \tag{11}$$

Finally, the quantum analogues to the classical identities (6) and (7) can be obtained directly just by replacing the classical elements by their quantum versions.

4 Algebraic Quantization and Refined Algebraic Quantization

Here we will detail the Algebraic Quantization adopted in Ref. [16], together with a brief description of the Refined Algebraic Quantization [19] at the end of this section.

4.1 Algebraic Quantization

Following the results of [16, 19], one may look for the solutions to the quantum constraints (9). After a transformation to polar coordinates $u_1 = u\cos\alpha$, $u_2 = u\sin\alpha$, $v_1 = v\cos\beta$ and $v_2 = v\sin\beta$, one finds that the corresponding solutions to the three constraints are given by

$$\Psi_{m,\epsilon} := e^{im(\alpha+\epsilon\beta)}J_m(uv), \tag{12}$$

where $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\epsilon \in \{1, -1\}$, and the functions $J_m(uv)$ are the Bessel functions of first kind [21]. With the exception of the identity $\Psi_{0,1} = \Psi_{0,-1}$, the remaining solutions are linearly independent [19].

Regarding the observable algebra (4), let us introduce the more convenient basis

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Q}_+ &= \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{Q}_1 + i\hat{Q}_2), \quad \hat{Q}_- = \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{Q}_1 - i\hat{Q}_2) \\ \hat{P}_+ &= \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{P}_1 + i\hat{P}_2) \quad \hat{P}_- = \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{P}_1 - i\hat{P}_2), \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

with $\hat{Q}_3$ and $\hat{P}_3$ unaltered. Their commutation relations are

$$\left[\hat{Q}_3, \hat{Q}_\pm\right] = \pm\hat{Q}_\pm, \quad \left[\hat{Q}_+, \hat{Q}_-\right] = -\hat{Q}_3, \tag{14}$$

$$\left[\hat{P}_3, \hat{P}_\pm\right] = \pm\hat{P}_\pm, \quad \left[\hat{P}_+, \hat{P}_-\right] = -\hat{P}_3. \tag{15}$$

The action of these operators on the solutions (12) is

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Q}_3\Psi_{m,\epsilon} &= \delta_{1,\epsilon} m \Psi_{m,\epsilon}\,, \quad \hat{Q}_\pm\Psi_{m,\epsilon} = \pm i\sqrt{2}\delta_{1,\epsilon} m \Psi_{m\pm1,\epsilon}\,, \\ \hat{P}_3\Psi_{m,\epsilon} &= \delta_{-1,\epsilon} m \Psi_{m,\epsilon}\,, \quad \hat{P}_\pm\Psi_{m,\epsilon} = \pm i\sqrt{2}\delta_{-1,\epsilon} m \Psi_{m\pm1,\epsilon}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Now, we can identify the sectors of this solution space providing an irreducible representation of this observable algebra, and endow them with a suitable inner product according to the adjoint relations

$$(\hat{Q}_3)^\dagger = \hat{Q}_3, \quad (\hat{Q}_\pm)^\dagger = \hat{Q}_\mp\,; \quad (\hat{P}_3)^\dagger = \hat{P}_3, \quad (\hat{P}_\pm)^\dagger = \hat{P}_\mp. \tag{17}$$

An straightforward calculation yields

$$(\Psi_{m,\epsilon_1}, \Psi_{m',\epsilon_2}) = a_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}|m|\delta_{m,m'}\delta_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}. \tag{18}$$

where the constants $a_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}$ do not depend on the label m. Therefore, the physical Hilbert space is endowed with a basis of normalizable states $\Psi_{m,\epsilon}/\sqrt{|m|}$ and carries four irreducible representations of the observable algebra, each of them being the completion of the subspaces

$$V_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2} := \text{span}\{\Psi_{m,\epsilon_2}|\epsilon_1 m > 0\} \tag{19}$$

with the inner product (18), that is $\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}$. The states $\Psi_{0,\epsilon}$ have zero norm. This is one of the main handicaps of the Algebraic Quantization, since its presence in the solution space prevents the construction of any Hilbert space. The remedy in this case is dropping the troublesome states, something attainable since they are annihilated by the whole observable algebra and then they can be decoupled from the physical Hilbert space.

Finally, we have four different constants $a_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}$ in the inner product (18). Fortunately, one can appeal to the reflection operator

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{R}_{\epsilon'_1,\epsilon'_2} : \quad & V_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2} \mapsto V_{\epsilon_1\epsilon'_1,\epsilon_2\epsilon'_2} \\ & \psi(u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2) \mapsto \psi(u_1, \epsilon_1 u_2, v_1, \epsilon_1\epsilon_2 v_2) \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

with adjoint relation $(\hat{R}_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2})^\dagger = \hat{R}_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}$. So, the original observable algebra completed with the previous one, is compatible with the Hilbert space provided by the direct sum of the four spaces $\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}$, but now with an inner product where the constants $a_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}$ coincide [19].

Finally, the operators $\hat{Q}_\pm$, $\hat{Q}_3$, $\hat{P}_\pm$ and $\hat{P}_3$ acting on the physical Hilbert space are

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Q}_3\Psi_{m,\epsilon} &= \delta_{1,\epsilon} m \Psi_{m,\epsilon}, \quad \hat{Q}_\pm \Psi_{m,\epsilon} = \pm i\sqrt{2}\delta_{1,\epsilon}\sqrt{|m(m\pm 1)|}\Psi_{m\pm 1,\epsilon} \\ \hat{P}_3\Psi_{m,\epsilon} &= \delta_{-1,\epsilon} m \Psi_{m,\epsilon}, \quad \hat{P}_\pm \Psi_{m,\epsilon} = \pm i\sqrt{2}\delta_{-1,\epsilon}\sqrt{|m(m\pm 1)|}\Psi_{m\pm 1,\epsilon}. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

4.2 Refined Algebraic Quantization

Regarding the Refined Algebraic Quantization of this model [19], one starts with the representation (9) and assumes that their solutions belong to the algebraic dual Φ^* of a dense subspace $\Phi \subset \mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}$. The latter is usually selected as an invariant, dense domain of the constraints (9). The observable algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\text{obs}}$ of the model is automatically determined by these requirements, and does not need to be included explicitly. The final step consists in introducing the so-called rigging map [7] between the spaces Φ and Φ^*, and which induces an inner product in the solutions space, and then the physical Hilbert space can be constructed out of. As was pointed out in Ref. [19], this map can be suitably defined once a convenient choice of Φ is made. In other words, the rigging map depends on the specific choice of test states Φ, and so the observable algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\text{obs}}$ and the physical Hilbert space. In particular, the overcompleted observable algebra considered in the Algebraic Quantization turns out to be a subalgebra of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{obs}}$, well defined on the corresponding physical Hilbert space. Therefore, the Refined Algebraic Quantization can be seen as a generalization of the Algebraic Quantization.

Now, we would like to emphasize that the natural choice of test space Φ includes zero norm vectors that impede the construction of a consistent rigging map. Then, the solution proposed in Ref. [19] is to ensure that at the end of the day the troublesome subspace is dropped by selecting a suitable test space Φ. The latter is carefully identified by means of the observable algebra explicitly introduced in the Algebraic Quantization, taking care that the observable algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\text{obs}}$ remain large enough. Then, the rigging map can be consistently constructed, and the quantum description completed.

In summary, both quantization schemes require additional information at different levels of the construction, providing final results that dependent on it.

5 Master Constraint Programme

Now, we will continue with the quantum description within the Master Constraint Programme. To this end, and for convenience, we will introduce the set of constraints $\hat{H}_\pm = \hat{H}_1 \pm \hat{H}_2$ with commutation relations

$$[\hat{H}_+, \hat{H}_-] = -2i\hat{D}, \quad [\hat{H}_+, \hat{D}] = -2i\hat{H}_-, \quad [\hat{H}_-, \hat{D}] = -2i\hat{H}_+. \tag{22}$$

The Master Constraint will be defined as

$$\hat{\mathbf{M}} = \frac{1}{2}(\hat{H}_+^2 + \hat{H}_-^2 + \hat{D}^2) = 2\hat{\mathcal{C}} + \hat{H}_-^2 \tag{23}$$

where we have employed the identity $4\hat{\mathcal{C}} = \hat{H}_+^2 + \hat{D}^2 - \hat{H}_-^2$ in the previous expression.[1]

In addition, we will introduce an equivalent formulation known as polarized Fock basis (see Ref. [13]). This basis is provided by the operators

$$\hat{A}_\pm := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{a}_1 \mp i\hat{a}_2), \qquad \hat{A}_\pm^\dagger := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{a}_1^\dagger \pm i\hat{a}_2^\dagger), \tag{24}$$

and the corresponding ones for the v-coordinates

$$\hat{B}_\pm := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{b}_1 \mp i\hat{b}_2), \qquad \hat{B}_\pm^\dagger := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{b}_1^\dagger \pm i\hat{b}_2^\dagger), \tag{25}$$

where

$$\hat{a}_i := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{u}_i + i\hat{p}_i), \quad \hat{b}_i := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{v}_i + i\hat{\pi}_i), \tag{26}$$

and their adjoints $\hat{a}_i^\dagger$ and $\hat{b}_i^\dagger$, are the standard creation-annihilation variables. A Fock state with respect to the annihilation operators $\hat{A}_\pm$ and $\hat{B}_\pm$ is given by $|k_+, k_-, k'_+, k'_-\rangle$. They are defined by means of

$$|k_+, k_-, k'_+, k'_-\rangle = \frac{(\hat{A}_+^\dagger)^{k_+}}{\sqrt{k_+!}} \frac{(\hat{A}_-^\dagger)^{k_-}}{\sqrt{k_-!}} \frac{(\hat{B}_+^\dagger)^{k'_+}}{\sqrt{k'_+!}} \frac{(\hat{B}_-^\dagger)^{k'_-}}{\sqrt{k'_-!}} |0,0,0,0\rangle \tag{27}$$

where $|0,0,0,0\rangle$ is the state which is annihilated by all four annihilation operators (in the same way that it is the vacuum state compatible with $\hat{a}_i$ and $\hat{b}_i$ with $i = 1, 2$).

We will carry out a spectral decomposition of several quantities in our model. In particular, the observables $\hat{\mathcal{C}}$, $\hat{H}_-$, $\hat{Q}_3$ and $\hat{P}_3$ can be simultaneously diagonalized together with the Master Constraint $\hat{\mathbf{M}}$.

First of all, in the polarized Fock basis the observables are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{Q}_\pm &= \mp\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{A}_\mp \hat{B}_\mp + \hat{A}_\pm^\dagger \hat{B}_\pm^\dagger) \\
\hat{Q}_3 &= \frac{1}{2}(\hat{A}_+^\dagger \hat{A}_+ - \hat{A}_-^\dagger \hat{A}_- + \hat{B}_+^\dagger \hat{B}_+ - \hat{B}_-^\dagger \hat{B}_-) \\
\hat{P}_\pm &= \mp\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{A}_\pm^\dagger \hat{B}_\mp^\dagger + \hat{A}_\mp \hat{B}_\pm) \\
\hat{P}_3 &= \frac{1}{2}(\hat{A}_+^\dagger \hat{A}_+ - \hat{A}_-^\dagger \hat{A}_- - \hat{B}_+^\dagger \hat{B}_+ + \hat{B}_-^\dagger \hat{B}_-)
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Since $\hat{Q}_3$ and $\hat{P}_3$ commutes with $\hat{\mathcal{C}}$ (i.e. with $\hat{\mathbf{M}}$), we can diagonalize them simultaneously, and similarly with $\hat{H}_-$. This four observables are sufficient to identify any state of the system.

The action of $\hat{Q}_3$ and $\hat{P}_3$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{Q}_3 |k_+, k_-, k'_+, k'_-\rangle &= q_3 |k_+, k_-, k'_+, k'_-\rangle, \quad q_3 := \frac{1}{2}(j - j'), \\
\hat{P}_3 |k_+, k_-, k'_+, k'_-\rangle &= p_3 |k_+, k_-, k'_+, k'_-\rangle, \quad p_3 := \frac{1}{2}(j + j').
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

---

[1] For convenience, we have selected a Master Constraint with a factor two with respect to the one adopted in Ref. [13].

where $j := k_+ - k_-$ and $j' := -k'_+ + k'_-$. Regarding the constraints $\hat{H}_\pm$ and $\hat{D}$, it is not difficult to realize that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_- &= \hat{A}_+^\dagger \hat{A}_+ + \hat{A}_-^\dagger \hat{A}_- - \hat{B}_+^\dagger \hat{B}_+ - \hat{B}_-^\dagger \hat{B}_- \,, \\ \hat{H}_+ &= -(\hat{A}_+ \hat{A}_- + \hat{A}_+^\dagger \hat{A}_-^\dagger + \hat{B}_+ \hat{B}_- + \hat{B}_+^\dagger \hat{B}_-^\dagger)\,, \\ \hat{D} &= i(\hat{A}_+^\dagger \hat{A}_-^\dagger - \hat{A}_+ \hat{A}_- + \hat{B}_+ \hat{B}_- - \hat{B}_+^\dagger \hat{B}_-^\dagger)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

with the spectrum of $\hat{H}_-$

$$\hat{H}_- |k_+, k_-, k'_+, k'_-\rangle = k |k_+, k_-, k'_+, k'_-\rangle, \quad k := k_+ + k_- - k'_+ - k'_-. \tag{31}$$

Finally, we will deal with the spectral decomposition of $\hat{\mathbf{M}}$, which is determined by the spectral properties of $\hat{H}_-$ and $\hat{\mathcal{C}}$ (the Casimir). Here we will sketch the main properties that will be necessary in our study (for a more detailed description see [13] and the references therein). Additional details can be found in Appendix A.

On the one hand, the spectrum of $\hat{\mathcal{C}}$ possesses both discrete and continuous counterparts. The discrete counterpart of $\hat{\mathbf{M}}$ is only for $k > 0$ and $|j| - |j'| \geq 2$ or $k < 0$ for $|j| - |j'| \leq 2$:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\text{discr}} &= 2t(1-t) + k^2, \\ \text{with} \quad t &= 1, 2, \dots, \tfrac{1}{2}\text{min}(|k|, ||j| - |j'||) \text{ for even } k, \\ \text{and} \quad t &= \tfrac{3}{2}, \tfrac{5}{2} \dots, \tfrac{1}{2}\text{min}(|k|, ||j| - |j'||) \text{ for odd } k. \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Otherwise, the continuous part is

$$\lambda_{\text{cont}} = \tfrac{1}{2} + \tfrac{1}{2}x^2 + k^2 > 0, \quad x \in \big[0, \infty\big). \tag{33}$$

where x is independent of the particular values of k, j and j'.

The normalized eigenfunctions $|j, j'\rangle_{t,k}$ corresponding to the discrete part of the spectrum are calculated in Appendix A, while the continuous ones where determined explicitly in Ref. [13]. We will use the notation $|x, k, j, j'\rangle$ for them, which will facilitate the distinction between normalizable and generalized eigenstates.

As one can see, the spectrum of the Master Constraint never vanishes. Its minimum value is in fact of the order of the square of the Planck constant (the reader must remind that we have set it to the unity), and belongs to the continuous part of the spectrum, corresponding to $x = 0$ and $k = 0$, i.e., to the eigenvalue $\lambda_{\text{cont}} = 1/2$. The prescription suggested in Ref. [13] modifies this observable by subtracting the corresponding contribution, yielding a new Master Constraint with a vanishing minimum eigenvalue. From now on we will refer to this eigenspace $|x = 0, k = 0, j, j'\rangle$ as the physical Hilbert space (for the Master Constraint Programme). Additionally, the restriction to this space of solutions of the observable algebra

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Q}_3\, |x = 0, k = 0, j, j'\rangle &= q_3\, |x = 0, k = 0, j, j'\rangle, \\ \hat{P}_3\, |x = 0, k = 0, j, j'\rangle &= p_3\, |x = 0, k = 0, j, j'\rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

where q_3 and p_3 are arbitrary (semi)integers –see Eqs. (29)–, indicates that the spectrum of these observables can simultaneously achieve arbitrary large values.

This is in contradiction with the classical theory, where the condition $Q_3 = 0$ or $P_3 = 0$ (or both) must be recovered somehow.

Again, the proposal in Ref. [13] consists in suitably reducing the quantum degrees of freedom by adding to the Master Constraint the condition $Q_3P_3 = 0$. Consequently, the final Master Constraint would be

$$\hat{\mathbf{M}}'' = \hat{\mathbf{M}} - \frac{1}{2}\hat{I} + \frac{1}{2}(\hat{Q}_3\hat{P}_3)^2. \tag{35}$$

The spectral decomposition of $\hat{\mathbf{M}}''$ is already known, since $\hat{Q}_3$ and $\hat{P}_3$ are diagonal in the basis $|x, k, j, j'\rangle$. The restriction to the eigenspace corresponding to the minimum eigenvalue of $\hat{\mathbf{M}}''$ yields $|x = 0, k = 0, j, j'\rangle$ but now with the condition $|j| = |j'|$, that is the requirement for a suitable semiclassical limit. Following Ref. [13], we will call this space of solutions SOL$''$.

However, the observables (28), while they obey the relations (6), they do not leave invariant SOL$''$. Nevertheless, one can find an alternative set of observable carrying out the relevant physical information. In fact, the classical observables of the type $p_1(Q_i)Q_3$ and $p_2(P_i)P_3$ with $p_1(y)$ and $p_2(y)$ being polynomial functions of y, commutes weakly with the Master Constraint $\mathbf{M}''$. In consequence, any observable $p_1(Q_i)|\text{sgn}(Q_3)|$ and $p_2(P_i)|\text{sgn}(P_3)|$ (with $\text{sgn}(x) = \{1, 0, -1\}$ for $x > 0$, $x = 0$ and $x < 0$, respectively) are also Dirac observables in the space of solutions, and then, they leave SOL$''$ invariant.

Therefore, the basic quantum algebra will be determined by the self-adjoint operators $\hat{Q}'_i := |\text{sgn}(\hat{Q}_3)|\hat{Q}_i|\text{sgn}(\hat{Q}_3)|$ and $\hat{P}'_i := |\text{sgn}(\hat{P}_3)|\hat{P}_i|\text{sgn}(\hat{P}_3)|$, defined by means of the spectral decomposition of $\hat{Q}_3$ and $\hat{P}_3$. These operators superselect five sectors in SOL$''$, one corresponding to each semiaxis of the coordinates q_3 and p_3 satisfying the condition $q_3p_3 = 0$, together with the origin $q_3 = 0$ and $p_3 = 0$. Additionally, in Ref. [13] are considered combinations of operators of the form $|\text{sgn}(\hat{Q}_3)|p_1(\hat{Q}_i)|\text{sgn}(\hat{Q}_3)|$ and $|\text{sgn}(\hat{P}_3)|p_2(\hat{P}_i)|\text{sgn}(\hat{P}_3)|$, breaking the mentioned superselection of the operators $\hat{Q}'_i$ and $\hat{P}'_i$ regarding the coordinates q_3 and p_3, and the resulting physical Hilbert space is given by the joint of the five previous subspaces.

We would like to comment that, from our point of view, the explicit inclusion of the observable $(\hat{Q}_3\hat{P}_3)$ in $\hat{\mathbf{M}}''$ might not be a good prescription to be adopted for the systematic quantization of fully constrained models owing to the difficulty of recognizing Dirac observables in more complicated settings.

6 Uniform Discretizations

6.1 Classical description

In this scheme, we start by considering a discrete classical theory, where the corresponding evolution of any phase space function F is dictated by

$$F_{n+1} = e^{\{\cdot,H\}}F_n := F_n + \{F_n, H\} + \frac{1}{2!}\{\{F_n, H\}, H\} + \ldots \tag{36}$$

with $H := f(H_1, H_2, D)$ a well defined functional of the constraints such that $f(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ is any non-negative function that only vanishes at the origin, it is nonlinear in the coordinates x_1, x_2 and x_3 and the second derivatives satisfy

$$\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} \neq 0, \quad \forall x_i. \tag{37}$$

In order to follow a similar analysis like the one proposed by the Master Constraint approach, we will identify H with the Master Constraint $\mathbf{M}$, i.e.,

$$H := 2\mathcal{C} + H_-^2, \tag{38}$$

recalling that the Casimir $\mathcal{C}$ was already defined in (6). One can straightforwardly prove that H satisfies all the previous requirements as a function of the constraints. The very first thing we may notice is that the observables (4) commutes with H, since they commute with the three constraints. Consequently, their discrete evolution is given by

$$(Q_i)_{n+1} = (Q_i)_n, \quad (P_i)_{n+1} = (P_i)_n, \quad \forall i = 1, 2, 3;\ n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{39}$$

They are, in consequence, constants of the motion, as well as $\mathcal{C}$, H_- and H itself. However, the constraints H_+ and D do not commute with H. In fact, one can prove that they oscillate around the surface constraint. Their evolution is dictated by

$$\begin{aligned} (H_+)_{n+1} &= (H_+)_n \cos(4H_-) + D_n \sin(4H_-), \\ D_{n+1} &= D_n \cos(4H_-) + (H_+)_n \sin(4H_-). \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

The transition matrix from an instant n to $n+1$ is an $SO(2)$ rotation, of angle $\alpha = 4H_-$. Recursively, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} (H_+)_n &= (H_+)_0 \cos(n\alpha) - D_0 \sin(n\alpha), \\ D_n &= D_0 \cos(n\alpha) + (H_+)_0 \sin(n\alpha), \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

where D_0 and $(H_+)_0$ are the initial data corresponding to each discrete trajectory. The amplitude of the oscillations si bounded since it is given by

$$0 < D_0^2 + (H_+)_0^2 = 2H - H_-^2 \leq 2H. \tag{42}$$

In fact, at any other instant n, the quantity $D_n^2 + (H_+)_n^2$ is a constant of motion, so the previous condition holds anytime. Clearly, for a given initial data $H = \delta^2/2$, with δ certain real parameter, in the limit $\delta \to 0$ one recovers the continuum theory.

6.2 Quantization

For the quantum description of the model, we will adhere to the kinematical Hilbert space explained in Sec. 3. We represent the operators $\hat{u}_i$, $\hat{p}_i$, $\hat{v}_i$ and $\hat{\pi}_i$ with $i = 1, 2$ in $\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}} = \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$, as was done in Eq. (8). Hence, the Hamiltonian (38) is promoted to the operator $\hat{H}$. Its spectral decomposition is the same as the one carried out for the Master Constraint $\hat{\mathbf{M}}$. Then, the spectrum of $\hat{H}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^H_{\text{discr}} &= 2t(1-t) + k^2, \\ \text{with} \quad t &= 1, 2, \ldots, \tfrac{1}{2}\text{min}(|k|, ||j| - |j'||) \text{ for even } k, \\ \text{and} \quad t &= \tfrac{3}{2}, \tfrac{5}{2} \ldots, \tfrac{1}{2}\text{min}(|k|, ||j| - |j'||) \text{ for odd } k, \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

for the discrete counterpart, with $k>0$ and $|j|-|j'|\geq 2$ or $k<0$ for $|j|-|j'|\leq 2$, and

$$\lambda^H_{\text{cont}}=\tfrac{1}{2}+\tfrac{1}{2}x^2+k^2>0,\quad x\in\big[0,\infty\big) \tag{44}$$

being its continuous spectrum.

The minimum eigenvalue of $\hat{H}$ is provided by $k=0$ and the minimum of the spectrum of $\hat{\mathcal{C}}$, which is in its continuous counterpart. The restriction to it, however, does not introduce any condition to j and j', as we saw in Sec. 5. In consequence, the spectrum of observables $\hat{Q}_3$ and $\hat{P}_3$ on this space can achieve any arbitrarily large value.

This is a fundamental aspect that force us to consider alternative possibilities, like restricting our study to the discrete spectrum. On it, the minimum is provided by $t=1$ and $k=\pm 2$, with no obvious restrictions for $(|j|-|j'|)$ –see (32)–. Then, in this subspace, the observables $\hat{Q}_3$ and $\hat{P}_3$ are not compatible with the continuum theory, like in the subspace related to the minimum of λ^H_{cont}. Nevertheless, we can consider instead the whole infrared spectrum of $\hat{H}$ that is compatible with, at least, certain subalgebra of observables.

Specifically, the restriction to any state satisfying $2t<|k|<\lambda^H_{\text{discr}}$ provides satisfactory restrictions to the possible values of $|j|-|j'|$, compatible with the continuum theory (up to quantum corrections). For a given

$$\lambda^H_{\text{discr}}=2t(1-t)+k^2,\quad \text{with}\quad 2t<|k|<\lambda^H_{\text{discr}}\ \Rightarrow\ ||j|-|j'||=2t, \tag{45}$$

as one can deduce from the definition of the discrete eigenvalues λ^H_{discr} in Eq. (43). Consequently, we have two subspaces labeled by $\pm k$. Each of them, in turn, can be split in

$$|j|-|j'|=\pm 2t. \tag{46}$$

If we recall the definition of q_3 and p_3 (the eigenvalues of $\hat{Q}_3$ and $\hat{P}_3$, respectively) given in Eq. (29), the previous condition (46) is equivalent to

$$|q_3+p_3|-|p_3-q_3|=\pm 2t. \tag{47}$$

A simple inspection yields

$$q_3=\pm t\quad\text{and}\quad |p_3|\geq t,\quad\text{or}\quad p_3=\pm t\quad\text{and}\quad |q_3|\geq t. \tag{48}$$

From now on, we will call $|q_3,p_3\rangle_{t,k}$ and $|x,k,q_3,p_3\rangle$ the normalizable and generalized eigenstates of $\hat{H}$, respectively, where we employ the labels q_3 and p_3 instead of j and j', in order to distinguish between our approach and the Master Constrain one. The space of physical states is the subspace $\{|q_3,p_3\rangle_{t,k}\}$ with q_3 and p_3 fulfilling (45) –and consequently (48)–. We also deduce that these spaces are 2-fold degenerated since $k>2t$ if $k>0$ and $k<-2t$ if $k<0$ (the specific expressions for these states can be found in Appendix A).

6.3 Observable algebra

The action of the observables (28) will be easily deduced from their commutation relations (up to a global phase), instead of a direct calculation involving a considerable number of algebraic manipulations. The phase will be then straightforwardly deduced.

Let us restrict the study to the observables $\hat{Q}_\pm$, since the analysis applies directly to the $\hat{P}_\pm$ ones. Recalling that the commutation relations of these observables are

$$[\hat{Q}_3, \hat{Q}_\pm] = \pm\hat{Q}_\pm, \quad [\hat{Q}_+, \hat{Q}_-] = -\hat{Q}_3, \tag{49}$$

and that the Casimir operator is

$$\hat{\mathcal{C}} = \hat{Q}_+\hat{Q}_- + \hat{Q}_-\hat{Q}_+ - \hat{Q}_3^2, \tag{50}$$

one can easily solve, thanks to the commutation relations (49),

$$2\hat{Q}_+\hat{Q}_- = \hat{Q}_3^2 - \hat{Q}_3 + \hat{\mathcal{C}}, \quad 2\hat{Q}_-\hat{Q}_+ = \hat{Q}_3^2 + \hat{Q}_3 + \hat{\mathcal{C}}. \tag{51}$$

Having said that, and recalling that the states $|q_3, p_3\rangle_{t,k}$ are normalized eigenfunctions of $\hat{Q}_3$ with eigenvalue q_3, from the commutation relations (49) we deduce that $\hat{Q}_\pm|q_3, p_3\rangle_{t,k}$ is either zero or proportional to $|q_3 \pm 1, p_3\rangle_{t,k}$, respectively. From the relations (51), we get

$$\begin{aligned} {}_{t,k}\langle q_3 \pm 1, p_3|q_3 \pm 1, p_3\rangle_{t,k} &= {}_{t,k}\langle q_3, p_3|(\hat{Q}_\pm)^\dagger\hat{Q}_\pm|q_3, p_3\rangle_{t,k} \\ = {}_{t,k}\langle q_3, p_3|\hat{Q}_\mp\hat{Q}_\pm|q_3, p_3\rangle_{t,k} &= {}_{t,k}\langle q_3, p_3|\hat{Q}_3^2 \pm \hat{Q}_3 + \hat{\mathcal{C}}|q_3, p_3\rangle_{t,k} \\ &= \tfrac{1}{2}q_3^2 \pm \tfrac{1}{2}q_3 + 2t(1-t) \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

Now, let assume that

$$\hat{Q}_\pm|q_3, p_3\rangle_{t,k} = q_\pm(q_3)|q_3 \pm 1, p_3\rangle_{t,k}. \tag{53}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Q}_\mp\hat{Q}_\pm|q_3, p_3\rangle_{t,k} &= q_\mp(q_3 \pm 1)q_\pm(q_3)|q_3, p_3\rangle_{t,k} \\ &= \left[\tfrac{1}{2}q_3^2 \pm \tfrac{1}{2}q_3 + 2t(1-t)\right]|q_3, p_3\rangle_{t,k}\ . \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

Furthermore

$$\begin{aligned} q_+(q_3) = {}_{t,k}\langle q_3 + 1, p_3|\hat{Q}_+|q_3, p_3\rangle_{t,k} &= \overline{{}_{t,k}\langle q_3, p_3|\hat{Q}_-|q_3 + 1, p_3\rangle_{t,k}} \\ &= \overline{q_-(q_3 + 1)}. \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

The solution to these equations is given by

$$q_\pm(q_3) = \frac{z_\pm(q_3)}{\sqrt{2}}(q_3 \pm t), \quad |z_\pm| = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad z_+(q_3)z_-(q_3 + 1) = 1. \tag{56}$$

Consequently, the states are determined up to a global phase.

The last step consists in determining this phase. The observables defined in Eqs. (28), up to the global factor i, are a linear combination of products (second order polynomial) of the operators $\hat{A}^\dagger_\pm$, $\hat{A}_\pm$, $\hat{B}^\dagger_\pm$ and $\hat{B}_\pm$. Now, consider the basis elements $|k_+, k_-, k'_+, k'_-\rangle$ of the polarized Fock quantization. The states $|q_3, p_3\rangle_{t,k}$ are linear combinations of these basis elements, with real coefficients. Besides, the action of the previous operators on a given state of the polarized basis turns out to be a linear combination of the elements of the basis, with also real coefficients. This allows us to conclude that, up to a global irrelevant sign, $z_\pm = \mp i$.

Finally, in the basis $|q_3, p_3\rangle_{t,k}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{Q}_+|q_3,p_3\rangle_{t,k} &= \frac{-i}{\sqrt{2}}[q_3+t]\,|q_3+1,p_3\rangle_{t,k}\\
\hat{Q}_-|q_3,p_3\rangle_{t,k} &= \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}[q_3-t]\,|q_3-1,p_3\rangle_{t,k}\\
\hat{Q}_3|q_3,p_3\rangle_{t,k} &= q_3\,|q_3,p_3\rangle_{t,k}\\
\hat{P}_+|q_3,p_3\rangle_{t,k} &= \frac{-i}{\sqrt{2}}[p_3+t]\,|q_3,p_3+1\rangle_{t,k}\\
\hat{P}_-|q_3,p_3\rangle_{t,k} &= \frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}}[p_3-t]\,|q_3,p_3-1\rangle_{t,k}\\
\hat{P}_3|q_3,p_3\rangle_{t,k} &= p_3|q_3,p_3\rangle_{t,k}
\end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

Therefore, the main difference with the Algebraic Quantization and the Master Constraint Programme is that, even if one starts with an state belonging to a physical space (the one that reproduces a good semiclassical limit for $\hat{Q}_3$ and $\hat{P}_3$), the repeated action of the observables $\hat{Q}_\pm$ and $\hat{P}_\pm$ would turn out in a state that does not belong to the original physical space (unless we include in the physical Hilbert space states with arbitrary large values of k, then losing the semiclassical limit).

6.4 Modified observable algebra

In order to overcome this drawback, we will present here a prescription of a modified observable algebra, based partially on the new observables introduced at the end of Sec. 5.

Let us define, appealing to the spectral theorem, the following operator

$$\hat{t} = \frac{1}{2}\hat{I} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{4}\hat{I} - \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{disc}}} \tag{58}$$

with $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{disc}}$ the restriction of the Casimir to its discrete spectrum and $\hat{I}$ the identity on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}} = \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$. The operator $\hat{t}$ has a discrete spectrum that equals the values of the parameter t in Eq. (32).

We will also define

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_q := \hat{I} - \delta_{|\hat{Q}_3|,\hat{t}}\,. \tag{59}$$

The spectrum of this operator is equal to the unity when $q_3 \neq \pm t$, and zero if $q_3 = \pm t$. Similarly, we define the operator

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_p := \hat{I} - \delta_{|\hat{P}_3|,\hat{t}}. \tag{60}$$

which are the identity when $p_3 \neq \pm t$, and zero in the subspaces $p_3 = \pm t$. These operators mimic the action of the operators $|\text{sgn}(\hat{Q}_3)|$ and $|\text{sgn}(\hat{P}_3)|$, respectively, employed in the definitions of $\hat{Q}'_3$ and $\hat{P}'_3$ (see the end of Sec. 5).

Our new modified algebra will consist in the original $\hat{Q}_3$ and $\hat{P}_3$, and the modified ladder operators

$$\tilde{Q}_\pm := \hat{\varepsilon}_q \hat{Q}_\pm \hat{\varepsilon}_q, \quad \tilde{P}_\pm := \hat{\varepsilon}_p \hat{P}_\pm \hat{\varepsilon}_p. \tag{61}$$

Their action in a given space $|q_3, p_3\rangle_{t,k}$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{Q}_+ |q_3, p_3\rangle_{t,k} &= (1 - \delta_{|q_3|,t})(1 - \delta_{|q_3+1|,t}) \frac{-i}{\sqrt{2}} [q_3 + t]\, |q_3 + 1, p_3\rangle_{t,k}, \\
\tilde{Q}_- |q_3, p_3\rangle_{t,k} &= (1 - \delta_{|q_3|,t})(1 - \delta_{|q_3-1|,t}) \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} [q_3 - t]\, |q_3 - 1, p_3\rangle_{t,k}, \\
\hat{Q}_3 |q_3, p_3\rangle_{t,k} &= q_3\, |q_3, p_3\rangle_{t,k}, \\
\tilde{P}_+ |q_3, p_3\rangle_{t,k} &= (1 - \delta_{|p_3|,t})(1 - \delta_{|p_3+1|,t}) \frac{-i}{\sqrt{2}} [p_3 + t]\, |q_3, p_3 + 1\rangle_{t,k} \\
\tilde{P}_- |q_3, p_3\rangle_{t,k} &= (1 - \delta_{|p_3|,t})(1 - \delta_{|p_3-1|,t}) \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} [p_3 - t]\, |q_3, p_3 - 1\rangle_{t,k} \\
\hat{P}_3 |q_3, p_3\rangle_{t,k} &= p_3 |q_3, p_3\rangle_{t,k}
\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

From this observable algebra, we deduce that i) the four states $|q_3 = \pm t, p_3 \pm t\rangle_{t,k}$ remain invariant under the action of all the previous observables, and ii) the subspaces

$$\begin{gathered}
\{|q_3 = \pm t, p_3 > t\rangle_{t,k}\}, \quad \{|q_3 = \pm t, p_3 < -t\rangle_{t,k}\}, \\
\{|q_3 > t, p_3 = \pm t\rangle_{t,k}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{|q_3 < -t, p_3 = \pm t\rangle_{t,k}\},
\end{gathered} \tag{63}$$

are also left invariant under this modified observable algebra. Besides, these new observables together with the previous subspaces provide a semiclassical limit in agreement with the Algebraic Quantization and the Master Constraint Programme.

It is worth commenting that, nevertheless, the observable $\hat{Q}_3 \hat{P}_3$ is not bounded on the physical space. This is one of the differences with the Algebraic Quantization and the Master Constraint Programme, where the previous quantity identically vanishes on physical solutions. Clearly, the condition $Q_3 P_3 \simeq 0$ is more restrictive than $Q_3 \simeq 0$ and/or $P_3 \simeq 0$. In our proposal, the latter is satisfied while the former do not. Nevertheless, in the limit $\hbar \to 0$, both conditions are equivalent and the continuum classical theory is always recovered.

7 Conclusions

We have considered a totally constrained system with an $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ gauge group. This system is sufficiently simple and manageable while carries difficulties that could be found in more sophisticated, totally constrained theories, like general relativity. We have reviewed the different approaches for the quantization of this model, with special emphasis in the different advantages and handicaps they present. In particular, the Algebraic Quantization (and its more sophisticated version, known as Refined

Algebraic Quantization) is able to provided a quantization where the physical Hilbert space is constructed from a subspace of the algebraic dual of a dense set of the kinematical Hilbert space, once it has been equipped with a suitable inner product. The main inconvenient, within this approach, is that at the end of the day one appeals to certain observables, requiring reality conditions in order to pick out the inner product. But in general models, the identification of such an observables could be a non-trivial task. Within the Refined Algebraic Quantization, one applies the group averaging techniques. But this approach requires averaging within a non-amenable group, introducing additional difficulties in order to achieve well defined integrations. Again, this question can be overcome by selecting a suitable family of test states [19]. As we have already seen, an alternate approach that is free of these drawbacks is the Master Constraint Programme. The Master Constraint possesses a minimum, non-vanishing eigenvalue where the corresponding infinite dimensional eigenspace is incompatible with a suitable semiclassical limit. Hence, the proposed solution to this problem is to include a modified Master Constraint, which is explicitly dependent on the Dirac observables, in order to restrict the study to a particular subspace where a suitable semiclassical theory is recovered. Therefore, one again appeals to the Dirac observables as a fundamental ingredient in the quantum description.

We suggest an alternative prescription, partially based on the Master Constraint Programme, within the Uniform Discretizations scheme. We identify the discrete Hamiltonian (the generator of the discrete evolution) with the original Master Constraint –a quadratic form in the $sl(2,\mathbb{R})$ constraints–. After quantization, we propose relaxing the restriction to the minimum eigenvalue adopted in the Master Constraint, and considering instead the whole infrarred counterpart of its spectrum. There we have seen that neither the set of generalized eigenstates nor some subsets of normalizable eigenfunctions reproduce by themselves a correct semiclassical limit, and additional considerations must be taken into account when constructing the Master Constraint. Nevertheless, there is a subfamily of finite norm eigenstates carrying out an inherent cut off, the ones fulfilling $2t < |k| < \lambda^H_{\rm discr}$, compatible with a semiclassical description when certain subalgebra of observables is considered. Whether this cut off is just accidental or not is something that must be understood studying alternative systems with non-amenable, gauge groups. Additionally, those solution spaces, however, are not invariant under the whole $so(2,1)\times so(2,1)$ algebra, losing the compatibility with the classical theory. In order to overcome this inconvenient, we modify this observable algebra at the quantum level, in such a way they have a well defined action and leave invariant the physical space while reproduce a suitable semiclassical limit. Our proposal can obviously be adopted by the Master Constraint Programme. These two approaches, in comparison with the Algebraic Quantization, possess a kinematical structure well adapted to the physical one, while in the latter the physical states belong to a larger functional space where, in particular, the state $q_3 = 0 = p_3$ is excluded by the quantum theory.

We are also interested on the quantum dynamics of the system. In the continuum theory, an usual strategy has been making use of the so-called evolving constants [22]. This was the original point of view adopted in Ref. [16], where the reality conditions required to the quantum evolving constants considerably restrict the possible choices of these quantum observables [17]. Moreover, the Uniform Discretizations can shed light on the relational evolution of this model. In particular, out of the surface constraint (but close to it), the system behaves dynamically as an unconstrained one. Hence, the well known problem of time is avoided, while the continuum theory is almost reproduced. At the quantum level, one can study the relational dynamics analyzing the conditional probabilities [14, 23] avoiding the selection of any particular variable as a time parameter and its consequent treatment as a classical variable. Here, one considers the probability that a given observable have a particular value when we make a measurement on another one. This point of view seems to be more natural since all the variables in the system are treated quantum-mechanically. In addition, the freedom that we have introduced by considering the whole infrared spectrum of $\hat{H}$ will turn out in a non-trivial, discrete quantum dynamics, where the system can evolve since there are many "energy" states available. We will study all these aspects in the future.

A Physical states: normalizable solutions

In this Appendix, we will describe the spectral resolution of $\hat{H}$ adopting the treatment of Ref. [13]. Essentially, one starts with a representation of the positive and negative discrete series of $sl(2,\mathbb{R})$. Each representation is associated with the corresponding Hilbert spaces of holomorphic and anti-holomorphic functions on the open unit disc in $\mathbb{C}$, respectively, endowed with the scalar product, in both cases,

$$\langle f,h\rangle_l=\frac{l-1}{\pi}\int_D f(z)\overline{h(z)}(1-|z|^2)^{l-2}dx\,dy \tag{64}$$

where D is the unit disc and $dxdy$ is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{C}$. If $l=1$ one simply considers the limit $l\to 1$ in the previous expression.

For the positive series, an orthonormal basis is given by

$$f^l_n:=\Big[\mu_l(n)\Big]^{-\frac{1}{2}}z^n\quad(n\in\mathbb{N})\quad\text{with}\quad\mu_l(n)=\frac{\Gamma(n+1)\Gamma(l)}{\Gamma(l+n)}, \tag{65}$$

while for the negative series, the corresponding basis is given by the complex conjugated of f^l_n. There exists also a unitary map between the polarized basis $\{|k_+,k_-,k'_+,k'_-\rangle\}$ and the basis provided by $f^l_n\otimes(f^{l'}_{n'})^*$, given by

$$\begin{aligned}U: f^{|j|+1}_n\otimes\left(f^{|j'|+1}_{n'}\right)^*\mapsto\qquad &(-1)^{n'}|k_+,k_-,k'_+,k'_-\rangle\quad\text{where}\\ 2n=k_++k_--|j|\,,&\quad j=k_+-k_-\,,\\ 2n'=k'_++k'_--|j'|\,,&\quad j'=-k'_++k'_-.\end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

In this representation the Master Constraint is a differential operator [13], whose eigenfunctions are of the form

$$f_{k,j,j'}(z_1,\overline{z}_2,t)=f_{k,j,j'}(z_1\overline{z}_2,t)\,z_1^{\frac{1}{2}(k-|j|+|j'|)}, \tag{67}$$

where the solutions that are regular at $z=0$, with $z:=z_1\overline{z}_2$, are

$$\begin{aligned}f_{k,j,j'}(z,t)&=(1-z)^{1-t-\frac{1}{2}(|j|+|j'|+2)}\\ &\times F\Big(1-t+\frac{1}{2}(-|j|+|j'|),1-t+\frac{1}{2}k,1+\frac{1}{2}(k-|j|+|j'|);z\Big),\end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

for $k-|j|+|j'|\geq 0$, and

$$f_{k,j,j'}(z,t)=(1-z)^{1-t-\frac{1}{2}(|j|+|j'|+2)}z^{\frac{1}{2}(-k+|j|-|j'|)} \\ \times F\Big(1-t-\frac{1}{2}k,1-t+\frac{1}{2}(|j|-|j'|),1+\frac{1}{2}(-k+|j|-|j'|);z\Big), \tag{69}$$

for $k-|j|+|j'|\leq 0$, being $t=\frac{1}{2}(1+\sqrt{1-\lambda+2k^2})$, $\mathrm{Re(t)}\geq\frac{1}{2}$ and $F(a,b,c;z)$ the hypergeometric function [21].

Finally, we can use the map U in (66) to transfer these results to the original kinematical Hilbert space $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$. To this end we rewrite (67) into a power series in z_1 and $\overline{z}_2$ using the definition of the hypergeometric function

$$F(a,b,c\,;z)=\frac{\Gamma(c)}{\Gamma(a)\Gamma(b)}\sum_{n=0}\frac{\Gamma(a+n)\Gamma(b+n)}{\Gamma(c+n)\Gamma(1+n)}z^n \tag{70}$$

and

$$(1-z)^{1-d}=\sum_{n=0}\frac{\Gamma(d+n-1)}{\Gamma(d-1)\Gamma(n+1)}z^n. \tag{71}$$

For $k-|j|+|j'|\geq 0$ we obtain

$$f(t;k,j,j')=U\Big(f_{k,j,j'}(z_1,\overline{z}_2,t)\Big) \\ =\sum_{m=0}a_m\,|k_+(m),k_-(m),k'_+(m),k'_-(m)\rangle \tag{72}$$

where

$$k_+(m)=m+\frac{1}{2}(k+j+|j'|),\quad k_-(m)=m+\frac{1}{2}(k-j+|j'|) \\ k'_+(m)=m+\frac{1}{2}(|j'|-j'),\quad k'_-(m)=m+\frac{1}{2}(|j'|+j') \tag{73}$$

and

$$a_m=(-1)^m\left[\mu_{(|j|+1)}\Big(m+\frac{1}{2}(k-|j|+|j'|)\Big)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}\left[\mu_{(|j'|+1)}(m)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \times\frac{\Gamma\Big(1+\frac{1}{2}(k-|j|+|j'|)\Big)}{\Gamma\Big(1-t+\frac{1}{2}(-|j|+|j'|)\Big)\Gamma\Big(1-t+\frac{1}{2}k\Big)} \\ \times\sum_{l=0}^{m}\frac{\Gamma\Big(1-t+\frac{1}{2}(-|j|+|j'|)+l\Big)\Gamma\Big(1-t+\frac{1}{2}k+l\Big)}{\Gamma\Big(1+\frac{1}{2}(k-|j|+|j'|)+l\Big)\Gamma\Big(1+l\Big)} \\ \times\frac{\Gamma\Big(t+\frac{1}{2}(|j|+|j'|)+(m-l)\Big)}{\Gamma\Big(m-l+1\Big)\Gamma\Big(t+\frac{1}{2}(|j|+|j'|)\Big)}. \tag{74}$$

It is worth comment that replacing k with $-k$, switching $|j|$ and $|j'|$ and multiplying with $(-1)^{\frac{1}{2}(-k+|j|-|j'|)}$, we obtain the coefficient a_m for the solution corresponding to $k-|j|+|j'|\leq 0$.

Normalizable eigenfunctions of $\hat{H}$:

Let us focus on the normalizable eigenfunctions of $\hat{H}$ with $2t < |k| < \lambda^{H}_{\mathrm{discr}}$. More precisely, we will start with those fulfilling $k - |j| + |j'| \geq 0$. Since $|j| - |j'| = \pm 2t$ and $|k| > 2t$, i.e. $k \pm 2t > 0$, the only possibility is that of $k > 0$. If we substitute this in (68) we get

$$f_{\pm}(z) = (1-z)^{-t\mp t-|j'|} F\left(1-t\mp t, 1-t+\frac{1}{2}k, 1\mp t+\frac{1}{2}k; z\right), \tag{75}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} f_{+}(z) &= (1-z)^{-2t-|j'|} F\left(1-2t, 1-t+\frac{1}{2}k, 1-t+\frac{1}{2}k; z\right) \\ &= (1-z)^{-|j'|-1} = \sum_{l=0} \frac{\Gamma\left(|j'|+l+1\right)}{\Gamma\left(|j'|+1\right)\Gamma\left(l+1\right)} z^{l}, \end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f_{-}(z) &= (1-z)^{-|j'|} F\left(1, 1-t+\frac{1}{2}k, 1+t+\frac{1}{2}k; z\right) \\ &= \frac{\Gamma\left(1+t+\frac{1}{2}k\right)}{\Gamma\left(1-t+\frac{1}{2}k\right)} \sum_{n,l=0} \frac{\Gamma\left(1-t+\frac{1}{2}k+n\right)}{\Gamma\left(1+t+\frac{1}{2}k+n\right)} \frac{\Gamma\left(|j'|+l\right)}{\Gamma\left(|j'|\right)\Gamma\left(l+1\right)} z^{n+l}. \end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

In each case, the corresponding eigenfunction (67) is

$$f_{+}(z_1, \bar{z}_2) = f_{+}(z_1\bar{z}_2) z_1^{\frac{1}{2}k-t} = \sum_{l=0} \frac{\Gamma\left(|j'|+l+1\right)}{\Gamma\left(|j'|+1\right)\Gamma\left(l+1\right)} \bar{z}_2^{l}\, z_1^{l-t+\frac{1}{2}k}, \tag{78}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f_{-}(z_1, \bar{z}_2) = f_{-}(z_1\bar{z}_2) z_1^{\frac{1}{2}k+t} &= \frac{\Gamma\left(1+t+\frac{1}{2}k\right)}{\Gamma\left(1-t+\frac{1}{2}k\right)} \\ &\times \sum_{n,l=0} \frac{\Gamma\left(1-t+\frac{1}{2}k+n\right)}{\Gamma\left(1+t+\frac{1}{2}k+n\right)} \frac{\Gamma\left(|j'|+l\right)}{\Gamma\left(|j'|\right)\Gamma\left(l+1\right)} \bar{z}_2^{n+l}\, z_1^{n+l+t+\frac{1}{2}k}. \end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

Let us now consider the case in which $k - |j| + |j'| \leq 0$. Again, $|j| - |j'| = \pm 2t$ and $|k| > 2t$. Since $k \pm 2t < 0$, we conclude that $k < 0$. Implementing all this in (69)

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\pm}(z) &= (1-z)^{-t\mp t-|j'|} z^{\pm t-\frac{1}{2}k} \\ &\times F\left(1-t-\frac{1}{2}k, 1-t\mp t, 1\mp t-\frac{1}{2}k; z\right) \\ &= (1-z)^{-t\mp t-|j'|} z^{\pm t+\frac{1}{2}|k|} F\left(1-t+\frac{1}{2}|k|, 1-t\mp t, 1\mp t+\frac{1}{2}|k|; z\right). \end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

or more specifically

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_+(z) &= (1-z)^{-2t-|j'|} z^{t+\frac{1}{2}|k|} F\left(1-t+\frac{1}{2}|k|, 1, 1+t+\frac{1}{2}|k|; z\right) \\
&= \frac{\Gamma\left(1+t+\frac{1}{2}|k|\right)}{\Gamma\left(1-t+\frac{1}{2}|k|\right)} \sum_{n,l=0} \frac{\Gamma\left(1-t+\frac{1}{2}|k|+n\right)}{\Gamma\left(1+t+\frac{1}{2}|k|+n\right)} \frac{\Gamma\left(2t+|j'|+l\right)}{\Gamma\left(2t+|j'|\right)\Gamma\left(l+1\right)} z^{n+l+t+\frac{1}{2}|k|}
\end{aligned} \tag{81}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_-(z) &= (1-z)^{-|j'|} z^{-t+\frac{1}{2}|k|} F\left(1-t+\frac{1}{2}|k|, 1-2t, 1-t+\frac{1}{2}|k|; z\right) \\
&= (1-z)^{2t-|j'|-1} z^{-t+\frac{1}{2}|k|} = \sum_{l=0} \frac{\Gamma\left(|j'|-2t+l+1\right)}{\Gamma\left(|j'|-2t+1\right)\Gamma\left(l+1\right)} z^{l+\frac{1}{2}|k|-t}.
\end{aligned} \tag{82}
$$

The corresponding eigenfunctions –see (67)– are

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_+(z_1, \bar{z}_2) &= f_+(z_1\bar{z}_2) z_1^{-\frac{1}{2}|k|-t} = \frac{\Gamma\left(1+t+\frac{1}{2}|k|\right)}{\Gamma\left(1-t+\frac{1}{2}|k|\right)} \\
&\times \sum_{n,l=0} \frac{\Gamma\left(1-t+\frac{1}{2}|k|+n\right)}{\Gamma\left(1+t+\frac{1}{2}|k|+n\right)} \frac{\Gamma\left(2t+|j'|+l\right)}{\Gamma\left(2t+|j'|\right)\Gamma\left(l+1\right)} z_1^{n+l} \, \bar{z}_2^{n+l+t+\frac{1}{2}|k|}
\end{aligned} \tag{83}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_-(z_1, \bar{z}_2) &= f_-(z_1\bar{z}_2) z_1^{-\frac{1}{2}|k|+t} \\
&= \sum_{l=0} \frac{\Gamma\left(|j'|-2t+l+1\right)}{\Gamma\left(|j'|-2t+1\right)\Gamma\left(l+1\right)} z_1^{l} \, \bar{z}_2^{l-t+\frac{1}{2}|k|}.
\end{aligned} \tag{84}
$$

The last step in our calculations consists of applying the unitary transformation (66) to the previous functions, and normalize them. The resulting eigenfunctions now read

$$
f_\pm(t,k,j,j') = \sum_{m=0} a_{\pm,m} |k_+(m), k_-(m), k'_+(m), k'_-(m)\rangle, \tag{85}
$$

with the coefficients a_m given by

a) $k-|j|+|j'| \geq 0$ and $|j|-|j'| = 2t$

$$
\begin{aligned}
a_{+,m} &= (-1)^m \left[\mu_{(|j'|+2t+1)}\left(m-t+\frac{1}{2}k\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\mu_{(|j'|+1)}(m)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\times \frac{\Gamma\left(|j'|+m+1\right)}{\Gamma\left(|j'|+1\right)\Gamma\left(m+1\right)}
\end{aligned} \tag{86}
$$

b) $k-|j|+|j'| \geq 0$ and $|j|-|j'| = -2t$

$$
\begin{aligned}
a_{-,m} &= (-1)^m \left[\mu_{(|j'|-2t+1)}\left(m+t+\frac{1}{2}k\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\mu_{(|j'|+1)}(m)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\times \frac{\Gamma\left(1+t+\frac{1}{2}k\right)}{\Gamma\left(1-t+\frac{1}{2}k\right)} \sum_{l=0}^{m} \frac{\Gamma\left(1-t+\frac{1}{2}k+l\right)}{\Gamma\left(1+t+\frac{1}{2}k+l\right)} \frac{\Gamma\left(|j'|+m-l\right)}{\Gamma\left(|j'|\right)\Gamma\left(m-l+1\right)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{87}
$$

c) $k - |j| + |j'| \leq 0$ and $|j| - |j'| = 2t$

$$\begin{aligned} a_{+,m} &= (-1)^m \left[\mu_{(|j'|+2t+1)}\left(m\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\mu_{(|j'|+1)}(m + t + \frac{1}{2}|k|)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\times \frac{\Gamma\left(1+t+\frac{1}{2}|k|\right)}{\Gamma\left(1-t+\frac{1}{2}|k|\right)} \sum_{l=0}^{m} \frac{\Gamma\left(1-t+\frac{1}{2}|k|+l\right)}{\Gamma\left(1+t+\frac{1}{2}|k|+l\right)} \frac{\Gamma\left(2t+|j'|+m-l\right)}{\Gamma\left(2t+|j'|\right)\Gamma\left(m-l+1\right)}. \end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

d) $k - |j| + |j'| \leq 0$ and $|j| - |j'| = -2t$

$$\begin{aligned} a_{-,m} &= (-1)^m \left[\mu_{(|j'|-2t+1)}\left(m\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\mu_{(|j'|+1)}(m - t + \frac{1}{2}|k|)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\times \frac{\Gamma\left(|j'|-2t+m+1\right)}{\Gamma\left(|j'|-2t+1\right)\Gamma\left(m+1\right)}. \end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

The normalized eigenfunctions are finally defined as

$$|j, j'\rangle_{t,k} := \sum_{m=0} \tilde{a}_m |k_+(m), k_-(m), k'_+(m), k'_-(m)\rangle \tag{90}$$

with

$$\tilde{a}_m = a_m \left(\sum_{l=0} |a_l|^2\right)^{-1}. \tag{91}$$

The states belonging to the infrared spectrum of $\hat{H}$ solve the three constraints $\hat{H}_\pm$ and $\hat{D}$ when quantum corrections of the Planck order are neglected.

Algebraic Quantization and physical states:

Given the solutions (67) to the Master Constraint, one can ask which is the relation between the states annihilated by $\hat{M}$ and the solutions (12) found within the Algebraic Quantization approach.

They can be easily computed by means of (67) just solving the equation $\hat{M}\Psi = 0$. In this case, we set $t = 1$ and $k = 0$ in (67). After applying the map (66), the resulting solutions are

$$f(t = 1; k = 0, j = m, j' = \epsilon m) = \sum_{l=0} (-1)^l |k_+(l), k_-(l), k'_+(l), k'_-(l)\rangle \tag{92}$$

where $f(t = 1; k = 0, j = m, j' = \epsilon m) = \Psi_{m,\epsilon}$. These states solve simultaneously the three constraints $\hat{H}_\pm$ and $\hat{D}$. Nevertheless, they do not belong to $\mathcal{H}_{\rm kin}$. Hence additional considerations are necessary in order to endow them with Hilbert space structure.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by PEDECIBA (Uruguay) and the Spanish MEC Project FIS2011-30145-C03-02. The authors acknowledge to G. A. Mena Marugán for helpful discussions.

References

[1] Dirac P A M 1964 *Lectures on Quantum Mechanics* (New York: Belfer Graduate School of Science, Yeshiva University)

[2] Ashtekar A and Lewandowski J 2004 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **21** R53

[3] Rovelli C 2004 *Quantum Gravity* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge)

[4] Thiemann T 2005 *Modern Canonical Quantum General Relativity* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge)

[5] Ashtekar A 1991 *Lectures on Non-perturbative Canonical Gravity* (New Jersey: World Scientific); Ashtekar A and Tate R S 1994 *J. Math. Phys.* **35** 6434; Marolf D 1999 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **16**, 2479; Mena Marugán G A 1996 *J. Math. Phys.* **37**, 196

[6] Ashtekar A, Lewandowski J, Marolf D, Mourão J and Thiemann T 1995 *J. Math. Phys.* **36**, 6456

[7] Giulini D and Marolf D 1999 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **16**, 2479; 1999 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **16** 2489

[8] Marolf D 1995 Refined Algebraic Quantization: Systems with a single constraint *Preprint gr-qc/9508015*; 1995 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **12** 1199; 1995 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **12** 1441; 1995 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **12** 2469

[9] Rendall A D 1993 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **10** 2261; 1994 *Lect. Not. Phys.* **434**, 319

[10] Thiemann T 2006 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **23** 2211; 2006 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **23** 2249

[11] Dittrich B and Thiemann T 2006 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **23** 1067

[12] Dittrich B and Thiemann T 2006 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **23** 1025; 2006 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **23** 1089; 2006 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **23** 1121; 2006 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **23** 1143

[13] Dittrich B and Thiemann T 2006 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **23** 1089

[14] Campiglia M, Di Bartolo C, Gambini R and Pullin J 2006 *Phys. Rev* D **74** 124012; 2007 *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **67** 012020

[15] Gambini R and Pullin J 2003 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90** 021301; Di Bartolo C, Gambini R and Pullin J 2002 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **19** 5275; Gambini R and Pullin J 2005 *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **37** 1689 [2005 *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **14** 2355]

[16] Montesinos M, Rovelli C and Thiemann T 1999 *Phys. Rev.* D **60** 044009

[17] Gambini R and Porto R A 2001 *Phys. Rev.* D **63** 105014

[18] Trunk M 1999 An $SL(2,\mathbb{R})$ model of constrained systems: Algebraic constrained quantization *Preprint* University of Freiburg THEP 99/3, hep-th/9907056

[19] Louko J and Rovelli C 2000 *J. Math. Phys.* **41** 132

[20] Louko J and Molgado A 2004 *J. Math. Phys.* **45** 1919

[21] Abramowitz M and Stegun I A 1970 *Handbook of Mathematical Functions*, ed M Abramowitz and I A Stegun *NBS Appl. Math. Ser.* vol. LV (U.S. GPO, Washington, DC, 1970), 9th ed

[22] Rovelli C 1990 *Phys. Rev.* D **42** 8; 1991 *Phys. Rev.* D **43** 2

[23] Gambini R, Porto R and Pullin J 2004 *New J. Phys.* **6** 45